



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,025	12/29/2000	Glen E. Shires	P273232 P10168	6430
7590	11/21/2005		EXAMINER	
KEVIN A REIF BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/750,025	SHIRES, GLEN E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quynh H. Nguyen	2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on remarks filed 22 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 4, 16-17 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vortman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,771,760) in view of Kilander et al. (U.S. Patent 5,742,675).

Regarding claim 1, Vortman et al. teach the steps of:

connecting a telephony server (Fig. 1, callback server 32) between a user station (Fig. 1, 22) and a call center (Fig. 1, 20) not having call back capabilities via a telephone switching network (callback server 32 handles callback request from customers), the call center in communication with at least one agent station (Fig. 1, agent terminal 38);

connecting a browser server to the telephony server and the user station and the agent station (col. 6, line 62 through col. 7, line 41);

the telephony server receiving a request from the user station via the browser server for a callback from an agent (col. 6, lines 32-43);

the telephony server calling the call center (col. 7, lines 61-66);

the telephony server calling back the user station and bridging a callback between the agent and the user (col. 8, lines 9-12).

However, Vortman et al. do not teach the availability of the agent being determined by detecting a DTMF ID entered when an available agent answers the phone.

Kilander et al. teach a method and apparatus for automatically distributing calls to available logged in call handling agents. A call handling agent logs on to his/her computer at his/her workstation. The call center server (CCS 20) processes the log-on transaction, acknowledges a valid log-on to the agent workstation. When the agent is ready to take a new call, the agent signals his/her availability to the CCS 20 by entering a command on the agent's computer and sending it over data link 26 to the CCS 20 (Fig. 2, 62, 64 and Fig. 3, 104, 106 and col. 6, lines 12-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of detecting when an agent is available to answer the phone call to determine the availability of the agent, as taught by Kilander, in Vortman's system thus making the system more efficient and user friendly by detecting the availability of an agent and authenticate the agent before connecting the customer to the agent so that customers do not waste their time waiting for an available agent.

Regarding claims 4 and 23, Vortman et al. teach the request for call back comprises a telephone number to be used for the call back (col. 6, lines 46-50) and a problem (col. 6, line 55); and matching the available agent to the problem (col. 7, lines 17-19).

Claims 16, 17, and 21 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 22, Vortman et al. teach the World Wide Web servers are used to allow customers to access information from an organization. It would have been obvious that if a user has an account then it would have been helpful for accounting purposes to also include an account number besides a call back number.

3. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vortman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,771,760) in view of Kilander et al. (U.S. Patent 5,742,675) and further in view of Bateman et al. (U.S. Patent 5,884,032).

Regarding claim 18, Vortman and Kilander do not teach initiating a co-browsing session between the available agent and the customer.

Bateman et al. teach initiating a co-browsing session between the available agent and the customer (col. 6, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of initiating a co-browsing session between the available agent and the customer, as taught by Bateman, in Vortman and Kilander's system in order to quickly serve customer thus allowing agent and customer sharing and looking at the same information.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Bateman et al. teach the agent and customer are viewing the same multimedia screen, and the agent can take order and/or

provide technical support (col. 6, lines 55-60), for example, customer billing information, and therefore the customer's web page is available to the agent.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant mainly argues that Vortman in fact already has call back capabilities because in Vortman col. 2, lines 29-30 teaches "provide improved callback capabilities for call centers". Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Vortman, callback server 32 handling callback requests from customers by calling the call center then conference the suitable agent with the customers (col. 2, lines 46-59), or manually call the customers back, there is no automated callback capabilities. Vortman teaches (col. 2, lines 29-30) that "provide improved callback capabilities for call centers" could mean that improving from zero callback capabilities or manual callback to automated callback capabilities. Claim 1 recites "a call center not having call back capabilities" is not true and inconsistent with Applicant's own specification (see page 4, line 1; page 6, lines 2-5) because a call center not having automated callback capabilities, an agent can manually perform a callback to customers.

Applicant argues that Bateman has callback capabilities. Examiner relies on Bateman only for the feature of co-browsing session between the available agent and the customer, since the primary reference Vortman already teaches a

Art Unit: 2642

call center that does not have automated callback capabilities but rather the callback server handles the call back requests from customers.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:15 A.M. to 4:45 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax

Art Unit: 2642

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quynh H. Nguyen

November 9, 2005

Benny Q. Tieu

**BENNY TIEU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

A.U. 2642